DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 062 527 VT 015 055

AUTHOR	Marland, S. P., Jr.
TITLE	Career Education: Three Speeches by the Commissioner.
INSTITUTION	Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C. Office of the Commissioner of Education.
PUB DATE	Dec 71
NOTE	49p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Career Education; Educational Innovation; Educational Needs; Models; *Program Development; Program Planning; *School Industry Relationship; *Speeches; Student Needs; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	Program Implementation

ABSTRACT

Included in this collection are speeches presented on the following occasions: (1) the NAM Joint Policy Committee Conference, Washington, D.C., November 11, 1971, (2) the Third Annual Conference of the Pennsylvania Personnel and Guidance Association, Pittsburgh, November 15, 1971, and (3) the Annual Convention of The American Vocational Association, Portland, Oregon, December 6, 1971. Titles of the speeches are: (1) "Education and Business--A Necessary Merger," (2) "Career Education--A New Frontier," and (3) "Career Education--300 Days Later." In addition to school industry relationship, other points discussed were: (1) the design of model programs, (2) development of strategies for implementing programs, and (3) actions taken in the Office of Education to support vocational education as the keystone of the career education arch. (JS)

ED 062527

CAREER EDUCATION: THREE SPEECHES BY THE COMMISSIONER

by
Sidney P. Marland, Jr.
U.S. Commissioner of Education
Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare

December, 1971

VT015055

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

EDUCATION AND BUSINESS --- A NECESSARY MERGER*

By S.P. Marland, Jr.
U.S. Commissioner of Education
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

When I was invited to speak before this Committee, I took the time to look over the list of members--and I found the list impressive from two points of view:

First, that such a group exists at all. It says a great deal for American industry that hundreds of executives would voluntarily serve on a committee devoted to the study of American education and engaged in the difficult task of formulating policy statements aimed at upgrading the profession of teaching and the art of learning. Let me say at the outset, in a new and I hope enduring spirit of receptiveness in my profession, that we gratefully receive all the help we can get from your profession--the profession of business leadership.

Second, that the individual members of the Committee are impressive in themselves, both in the degree and the range of their accomplishments --- an oil company executive from the East Coast, a truck and tractor dealer from the West Coast, a big city publisher and a small town banker--to name only a few at random. I was pleased to note in passing that I was personally acquainted with a few of your members; but not nearly as many as I expect to know as the relationship between the Office of Education and the National Association of Manufacturers grows and becomes more systematic and intimate in the months ahead.

---

*Before the NAM Joint Policy Committee Conference, Washington Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C., Thursday, November 11, 1971, 2:30 p.m.

Of course, there is nothing essentially new about a cooperative posture between industry and the community in American life--or between business and the government--at any level. But there has been a change recently in the degree of such cooperation.

Business leaders have earned a reputation as the movers and shakers at the local level in the major charitable campaigns, for example. These men and women go out and lend their skill at organization and management to make such campaigns a success throughout the entire community, often in the face of almost overwhelming ennui on the part of the general public.

At the Office of Education, by the way, we have just completed the annual exercise known as the Combined Federal Campaign--a sort of bureaucratic parallel to the United Givers Fund, with which so many of you are familiar. It was not easy. In the face of the wage-price freeze, a general cutback on Federal employment and an Administration directive to reduce grade levels--and therefore salaries--the mood of the average Federal worker was understandably cool when it came time to move against his pocketbook.

In an attempt to get the annual campaign off dead center, I met with the top staff of the Office and reminded them of the famous mountain climber who had been missing for days atop one of the world's more challenging peaks. A rescue party was formed, went up the slope, and began "hallooing" across the ravines. Eventually, they heard a voice faintly in the distance. "This is the Red Cross," shouted his

would-be rescuers. "Never mind," the voice replied, "I gave at the office."

Well, we are all involved in our communities--and have been for years. But there is a change, nonetheless. We are becoming much more deeply involved in a great many more things than ever before--and the community itself has become much larger. It no longer involves just one home town, one school district, or even one county or State.

I think there is an Education Committee of the National Association of Manufacturers because the industrial leaders of America have a much better feel for their involvement in and their responsibility for education than ever before. We--the educators and the businessmen--are coming ever closer because we both know that we must establish solid lines of communication and fruitful exchange, not only in the self-serving benefits that we could both gain, but because the process is intrinsically right.

Two weeks ago we celebrated American Education Week. I know that many of you were involved in local or State activities in connection with this annual exercise. On that occasion, President Nixon issued an especially important statement, designating the week as an official recognition of the overriding importance of education to the country as a whole.

Allow me now to read to you a few lines from that proclamation which I think capsulizes the Administration commitment to education:

"...we recognize that our success in meeting unprecedented social, scientific, and physical change, and in directing its forces to positive ends, will be determined essentially by the quality of our schools, colleges and universities, by the wisdom with which we develop and employ new educational techniques and technologies, and above all, by the compassion and understanding with which we reach out to all people--especially the young--and impart to each the intellectual and occupational enrichment which every American deserves.

"...Our country is moving purposefully and effectively to strengthen and develop the great partnership of interests--Federal, State, local and private--through which we can accomplish our educational aims. Our educational leaders are not acting independently but with a new sense of co-operative unity, determined to use all resources, explore all initiatives, and recast the laws, if necessary, in order to serve our national needs. This is not an easy task, and if we are to succeed, we must call upon the assistance and support of all the American people."

That was the essence of President Nixon's statement of late October.

It is a strong plea for exactly the kind of enlightened cooperation the Office of Education is now getting from the National Association of Manufacturers and its Education Committee. I have read with great

interest the several Public Policy Reports of this Committee, and these documents are under serious study by the appropriate components of the Office at this time. In at least one case, we can report that we were already thinking along the same lines and can respond with quick affirmation to your recommendation that we name a qualified person of appropriate rank to be designated at the Federal education level to coordinate and encourage industry-education co-operation. Your resolution suggests a similar post at State and local levels.

I am pleased to be able to tell you that Mr. Louis Mendez of my staff was appointed last March to just such a position. His job was designed to "establish and maintain high level relations with groups concerned with schools and colleges...including business, industrial, volunteer, research and scientific organizations with activities related to education."

I should add that since receiving a copy of your policy report titled "Industry-Education Coordinator", we have moved to have Lou Mendez' job description rewritten to conform more closely with your recommendations and our needs. He will henceforth be known as the "Industry-Education-Labor Coordinator for the U.S. Office of Education", working directly under the supervision of Charles Saunders, Deputy Commissioner for External Relations.

Mr. Mendez will have full staff responsibility at the Office of Education for coordinating all of our activities aimed at

developing closer relationships between industry, labor, and the schools. He will also provide technical advice and assistance to State and local school agencies in regard to the appointment of his counterparts at those levels--in line with your call for such Industry-Education Coordinators.

Your thinking and mine have gone along parallel lines in still another area---vocational education (my term is Career Education)--a topic which I would like to discuss with you today in some detail.

All of you here have a deep professional concern with economic productivity and, therefore, with the way we prepare young people for a lifetime of work. We have traditionally referred to this preparation as vocational education. We now call it -- in a new term with new meanings -- career education. That does not mean, however, that the two terms are synonymous. Not at all. And I feel it is very important that we agree on the differences between them.

For many reasons, vocational education by itself has not been the whole answer in the United States. Our high schools have just not been able to assure that every young man and woman who receives a diploma is qualified either for immediate employment or for further education.

American business, individually and through organizations such as the National Association of Manufacturers, has repeatedly expressed its deep and abiding faith in education as a generalization.

you have been quick to call us to account for the young people entering your work force with less than satisfactory basic skills.

However, it is also fair to say that the grave failure of this Nation to prepare many of its young for work cannot be laid at the feet of the vocational educators. Only about 12 percent of our high school students have traditionally been exposed to systematic skill-producing training, though that percentage has gone up in the last year because of substantially increased Federal funding for the purpose being made available to the States and communities.

Alongside this small percentage we must place another statistic of the current educational scene -- that fully half of all high school students enroll in college after graduation. Superficially, that sounds fine. But too many take this step, I fear, because a pernicious conformism infecting our society forces them to flock to campuses to get credentials many don't really need--or indeed seriously want, as evidenced by the large number who opt out without a degree.

Among other requests that I make of you as we increase our partnership, is to wear your parent's hat as well as your business hat, and help us shake off the dubious folklore that all roads to excellence lead through the AB degree.

Finally, in addition to the vocational and academic tracks, there is a third group of students, those locked into the ill-conceived, unproductive general curriculum. Like the durable mule, the general curriculum has no pride in ancestry and no hope of progeny. Yet it is there.

The general curriculum, for those of you not familiar with it, is a fallacious compromise between the true academic liberal arts and the true vocational offerings. It is made up, as the name implies, of generalized courses, possessing neither the practicality and reality of vocational courses, nor the quality and intellectual discipline of college-preparatory offerings.

Students in this general track have little likelihood of attending college. And, given the vagueness of their high school preparation, they have no prospects for a decent job when--and if--they are graduated.

Career education would provide the training these students require for successful employment and it would give them motivation and purposefulness for the academic education they need to bring personal fulfillment into their lives. While career education will necessarily and properly embrace many of the vocational-technical education skill-producing activities, it will also reach a large percentage of students presently unexposed to the usual vocational offerings.

Career education, in sum, would reflect a far broader understanding of the purpose of education in today's highly sophisticated, technical, change-oriented society -- the need not only to fit a person to function efficiently, but to make him aware of why he is doing what he is doing...and to bring relevance to our classrooms for many who, with reason, now find learning meaningless.

Again, our thinking has been moving along similar pathways. The pyramid-shaped "logo" which appears on all of this Committee's documents carries the slogan, "Relevant Education for the '70s." You are correct

to assume that there has been a lot of irrelevant or barely relevant education available to the young people of this country. I assure you that it is our intention to remedy this situation...and Career Education will be one of the major reform processes that we expect to use in that job.

Nearly 150 years ago Thomas Carlyle stated his great law of culture to be: "Let each become all that he was created capable of being." Today, it is finally within our power to achieve something close to that ideal and to do so in the foreseeable future.

Cooperation between the Office of Education and individual businesses and industries is, of course, of primary importance as we move toward this ideal. Much of our past collaboration has dealt with what has always been known as vocational education--cooperative or work-study--and manpower development and training.

Three years ago, for example, the Office of Education awarded a contract to the Portland Concrete Association, the National Ready Mixed Concrete Association and the American Concrete Institute to develop and evaluate a two-year concrete technology curriculum. Although the final report is not expected until August of next year, this industrywide cooperative effort is now being field-tested and refined at six educational institutions across the country. The end product of this mutual research and development effort will include highly relevant vocational education courses, adult continuing programs, apprenticeship training, job upgrading programs in manpower programs and on-the-job training for specific positions.

As you may know, the Office of Education operates the national program of institutional training called Manpower, which is bureaucratic shorthand for the various programs available under the Manpower Development and Training Act.

These courses offer intensive training in specific skills. Examples include: mechanical engineering and medical technicians; various service-type occupations, including chefs and cocks, dry cleaning specialists and hospital attendants; farming, fishing and forestry; and a wide variety of machine trades, such as assemblers, machinists, and utilities servicemen. There is even a very specific course to retrain some 63,000 mechanics to service the new antipollution devices required on our cars by Federal law.

I remember on one occasion when I was Superintendent of Schools in Pittsburgh, we decided to offer a meat cutter's course with guaranteed jobs in the super-markets of the region. We were about to give it up when we found that at least $2,000 worth of beef in sides were required for each student's laboratory work, and that the product would not be skillfully enough prepared for retail counters. Suddenly, a bologna manufacturer (a creative industrial partner like you) came up with the solution. He did not deal with beef sides for steaks and roasts. He used tough old cows. Noting the identical anatomy between old cows and choice steers, he said he would be delighted to have our MDTA student make prime steaks and roasts out of his cows, and he would then grind them up for fine bologna. He even agreed to furnish haulage both ways.

The total program under the Manpower Development and Training Act for the current fiscal year is expected to cost about three quarters of a billion dollars ($748,800,000). However, of this amount only a little more than a quarter of a billion ($266,084,000), is for institutional training administered by my office. The program will provide training for about 146,000 workers in the year ending next June 30.

All recent studies, including some investigations now being validated by private research firms, show that--in terms of cost-benefit ratio--our OE institutional training is far more effective than other forms of manpower training. This can be shown on the basis of longevity--that is, the enduring placement of the trainee in the labor force once he is trained--and in terms of the benefit to the individual--his acquisition of marketable skills and improvement in his attitudes and work habits, per dollar expended.

The Office of Education could greatly increase the return on its investment in this field if it could bring more funds to bear on the problem. In fact, we could quadruple the money to good use right now.

This sort of training activity clearly falls under the new career education heading but career education courses are not limited to this type of occupation, nor should we think of Career Education as being chiefly concerned with the disadvantaged.

One of the alternate systems being developed in the Industry-Education partnership concept is known to us as Model II. This will be the Employer-Based Career Education Program. It proposes to use the community as a classroom for the comprehensive education of junior and senior high school students. In the Fall of next year, several groups of private and public employers will begin to test the program at a number of OE-financed pilot sites. The primary objective will be to prepare each student for a meaningful and relevant role in society through multiple career experiences and to test individual career interests in real work situations outside of school buildings. It will provide a specific alternate system for those young people choosing to step aside from the conventional school. Boards of Education, under this scheme, would contract with industry to provide the system. We are talking about a totally new social process, of which you should be hearing more during the next six months.

I have, as I said, read the public policy reports of the NAM's Education Committee which have come to my attention--and there have been four of these: on higher education, on elementary and secondary education, on vocational education and on the appointment of Industry-Education Coordinators at Federal, State and local levels.

There is an area of education missing from these official policy positions of the Committee--an area which I predict will become rapidly more important to you and to me as time goes on. I'm talking about international education.

The Office of Education is deeply involved in international education through a variety of programs, most of them funded by appropriations directly to the Office, but others in which we utilize funds from the Department of State for Teacher Exchange Programs and from the Agency for International Development to provide technical training in America for key personnel from countries all over the world.

Why should this be of particular importance to the Education Committee of the National Association of Manufacturers? Well, as many of you certainly know, an extremely important recent development in world trade has been the multinational corporation--the entity with employees from many nations and with plants and marketing outlets scattered over the face of the globe.

There are some 250 truly multinational corporations now operating. Of that number, about 200 are primarily American corporations. The rest are headquartered in a number of other highly industrialized nations.

Many of our programs are of very special interest to such corporations, and to many other American companies which either deal with such corporations or have aspirations of developing such overseas operations in the future.

For a moment, let's take a look at some of these:

The Office of Education now sponsors some 106 Language and Area Centers at 63 colleges and universities throughout the United States,

plus research projects and fellowships--all under Title VI of the National Defense Education Act. The Office administers Section 102 (b) (6) of the Fulbright-Hays Act, which supports Ph.D. dissertations, faculty research, and foreign curriculum consultants in the special fields dealing with international education. And the Office administers certain group programs overseas, using U.S.-owned excess foreign currencies---often called counterpart funds---for international studies, under Public Law 480.

All of these activities come under the jurisdiction of a special unit in the Office of Education known as the Institute of International Studies, headed by Associate Commissioner Dr. Robert Leestma.
Dr. Leestma, in his testimony earlier this year before the House Appropriations Committee, characterized the Public Law 480 programs as "efforts to help the United States function more effectively in an increasingly interdependent world."

The program improves the quality of foreign language and area study instruction in the United States primarily by developing or upgrading at this stage the abilities of teachers and university professors. This is done by providing opportunities for them to work and study abroad and to become immersed in the languages and cultures they expect to teach.

There is not time here today to describe even briefly all the Institute's activities. My object is to stimulate some interest in this important area of activity of the Office of Education in the hope that this committee of the NAM will give it the same attention it has

already given to some other, better known, fields, particularly as you view this powerful resource for your own international goals and interests.

In closing, let me reiterate my appreciation of the opportunity to address this exceptionally important group. Your interests in education have already proved to be as broad as ours--and we have much in common.

I have attempted to outline as briefly as possible the very great range of involvement of the Office of Education with business and industry--from the special training of mechanics in repairing exhaust emission control devices on automobiles to setting up language and area study centers throughout the country to improve the professional competence of potential international business and industrial representatives. I am looking forward to working with you across this entire spectrum.

# # # #

OE-OC

CAREER EDUCATION --- A NEW FRONTIER*

By Sidney P. Marland, Jr.
U.S. Commissioner of Education
Department of Health, Education and Welfare

Perhaps because Pittsburgh holds many memories for me, I found myself running my own "This is Your Life" as I prepared my remarks for this sentimental journey.

I found myself going all the way back to my high school days and the teacher who doubled as my guidance counselor. We didn't have full-time counselors in small Connecticut towns when I was coming up. At least we didn't call them that --- though they were.

At some point in my junior year she and I sat down to discuss what I should do with my life. As I remember it, she looked at my school records and aptitude tests and said that my abilities were in what I considered some rather unlikely fields -- architecture, insurance sales, civil engineering, and the performing arts.

Now that I have spent 30-odd years in education, I realize she was trying to tell me I had the makings of a school administrator. In fact, as most of you know, I rounded out 20 years as a superintendent right here in the Pittsburgh system. And I must say that, given the assortment of skills that we now recognize as essential for a working superintendent, I would say that my old counselor was light years ahead of her time.

It's good to be back in Pittsburgh -- to see so many familiar faces -- to recall the solid professional companionship you gave me

---

*Before the Third Annual Conference of the Pennsylvania Personnel and Guidance Association, Chatham Center, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Monday, November 15, 1971, 9:15 A.M.

during my years here as superintendent -- and to note with satisfaction that education in Pennsylvania, and Pittsburgh in particular, continues to flourish in an atmosphere of national leadership. For example, I was especially proud recently to call attention before Congress to the landmark legislation in Pennsylvania in support of education of handicapped children.

On this occasion it is not only a pleasure but a privilege to be back in the city. You have asked me to participate in a conference of personnel and guidance people with "Quo Vadis?" as its theme. You have assembled more than a thousand representatives from your own fields, from school and college administration, from industry and civic life -- plus enough young graduate students to keep us honest. And you have given me a platform to talk to these decision-makers and doers about a subject close to my heart.

I want to talk about career education, about coming together as responsible professionals to design renewal of the American educational system so that every young man and woman, no matter where he or she leaves the system, will take from it a proudly held marketable job skill, at any age, at any time.

I want to talk about the need for career education -- about designing model programs that will give us directions as to <u>what</u> should be done, and about developing strategies that will tell us <u>how</u> to do it. I would mention the kind of commitment on the part of everyone involved --- from student to teacher to counsellor to

administrator to legislator and certainly to parents --- that is needed if we expect to make career education a reality for young people everywhere. Finally, I would like to suggest fundamental realignments needed in guidance and counseling as we move toward this very large ideal.

If we are going to develop and install a career education system in the 70s -- and I think we must if we hope to deal with a significant number of this country's education-related problems from unemployment to drugs to delinquency to alienation --- then we need to plot a sober course at the outset, and we all need to have a part in the design. We in Washington certainly have no ambition to blueprint a program, cast it in bronze, and deliver it. The program, if it is to be built, will be built by people like you across the land. We in OE will encourage, provide money and technical assistance, but no approved solutions.

Those of you in the personnel and guidance fields, in industry, and in local and State government have particularly vital roles and responsibilities in this undertaking. We at the Federal level earnestly solicit your ideas, your insights, and your support as we undertake very positive initiatives in regard to career education at this juncture in our social and economic history.

But, before I describe what I mean by career education, let me stress what I <u>don't</u> mean, and that requires citing a few cost and productivity figures coming out of the educational system we call the world's best.

Education has become the Nation's largest enterprise. It now costs $85 billion a year, which surpasses defense outlays, previously our largest expenditure, by some $9 billion, and figures out at about 8 percent of the gross national product. I might add that education's share of the GNP has doubled since 1954.

Let's take just the cost of elementary and secondary education. That runs to $54 billion annually to teach 52 million children. The per pupil cost is roughly $1,000 a year, or $12,000 to $13,000 to get each youngster through the first 12 grades. Higher education costs, as any parent of a college student knows, are now somewhere in the neighborhood of $2,000 to $4,000 a year.

Along with the intangibles they buy for children with this kind of money, such as self-confidence, love of learning, and social awareness, I think parents and other taxpayers have the right to assume they are also buying appropriate, self-sustaining career skills that will enable almost all young people to be economically independent when they leave the system.

But the statistics don't support the assumption. Of 3.7 million young people leaving formal education in 1970-71, nearly 2.5 million lacked skills adequate to enter the labor force at a level commensurate with their academic and intellectual promise. Many left with no marketable skill whatsoever.

---850,000 dropped out of elementary or secondary school during the year. Let's assume on the average they left at the end of the 10th grade. At $8,000 per child to

get them that far, total cost to the Nation can be estimated at about $9 billion.

---750,000 graduated from the high school general curriculum with little or nothing to offer prospective employers. At $12,000 per student, total cost to the Nation would be $9 billion.

---850,000 entered college but left without a degree or completion of an organized occupational program. Let's assume on the average they left at the end of the first college year, which added $3,000 to the $12,000 per pupil outlay through high school. Total cost to the Nation can be estimated at $12 billion.

These three groups of youngsters, then, represent a combined outlay of nearly $28 billion --- about one-third of the entire amount spent on education in this country last year. We spend billions to prepare 2.5 million young people for potential disenchantment, aimlessness and failure, year after year after year!

Even more distressing are the losses we cannot calculate in dollars -- the loss of confidence and self-esteem, the sense of alienation and drift, the terrible sense of abasement and non-fulfillment that burdens millions of young people as they embark upon their adult lives. The aftermath of these early defections, of course, usually turns up in our unemployment, welfare, and crime statistics.

The other extreme, of course, is the over-educated young person, at least in terms of the career opportunities available when he or she is ready to enter the labor market. This year young American college-level teachers with doctor's and master's degrees are teaching in German gymnasiums or Australian high schools because there are not enough teaching opportunities in this country. In some fields there are seven applicants for every opening. And there are disturbing instances where highly qualified but also highly specialized engineers and other technicians, displaced in the aerospace and related industries, have turned in desperation to running hamburger drive-ins or tending bar. Surely America can do better than this. Surely the art and science of counselling and educational planning can do better than this.

Surely a Nation that can meet virtually any material or physical challenge it sets its sights on, and is willing to align its priorities accordingly, can develop a better approach to the whole career education process, designed to make education more real, more humane, and more responsive to the needs of young people. Trying to pinpoint responsibility is a fruitless exercise; there is more than enough to go around. Suffice it to say that for many years now, most noticeably in the post-Sputnik period, educators, parents, industry and government have been obsessed with the notion that a college education is a young person's only ticket to social worth, economic success, and emotional and intellectual wholeness.

Counselors have found it fashionable, personally satisfying and institutionally rewarding to be a part of that historic cycle.

We have provided good high school programs -- and good counseling -- for the minority of students going on to higher education. We have provided vocational training and perhaps adequate counseling -- much of it at least very good -- for the minority of students who were not college-bound and recognized the need for immediate job skills.

But we have shamefully shortchanged the majority of students nationally who have taken neither college preparatory nor out-and-out vocational education; those unfortunate youngsters were given a pallid succotash of some mathematics, some science, some social studies in something called the general curriculum. Its victims enter the job market with nothing to offer beyond their diplomas. Even their basic skills in reading, say, or spelling for lack of academic relevance are often weak and unattractive to employers.

High school counselors, unfortunately, have tended to devote most of their attention to students they could steer into college and understandably so, since that's the way a counselor's performance has been gauged in our value system. They have been part of the problem as they have dutifully responded to the mores of our people.

But that game is over, I hope, and I think it is high time we made some binding promises to young people -- not to mention financially pressed parents -- that we will take the necessary steps to make school meaningful for them, particularly in a career sense. For an educational system that expends $85 billion annually and

consumes most of childhood and much of early adult years, we are suddenly being called to account, not only by taxpayers, but by the young.

We must guarantee job entry skills for all high school graduates and most dropouts, skills as basic as typing and food preparation perhaps, but undergirded by the sound foundation in mathematics, the social sciences, and English that all of us need to function in virtually any field of employment. I have spent a good bit of my life, as I know you have, attempting to keep young people in school--to reduce the dropout ratio. At the risk of voicing heresy, I must say that those young people who have opted out of our high schools and colleges are not necessarily at fault. It may be that we in the schools and colleges are only now coming to realize that given their choice, they have rejected us. The concept of career education would encourage the opt-out to leave the system whenever he wishes, provided he is ready for satisfying and appropriate work, but he would also be welcomed back into the system cordially and routinely at whatever point he wishes to re-enter and at whatever age. Perhaps career education will set aside forever the whole question of the dropout.

We must provide the option of increasingly sophisticated technical skills for all graduates of two-year colleges and technical institutes, skills moreover for which there is a real demand in the marketplace. Fully half the young people in community colleges should enjoy this option.

We must guarantee relevant career skills for all college graduates with a baccalaureate degree or better. More and more I am impressed with the numbers of young people in our high schools and colleges who seem not to be strongly motivated at this time by economic goals. They seem more to be concerned with helping people and with serving large social causes. I think it should be made clear that lack of economic motivation in no way suggests a disregard for career education, for these very same young people, if they are to serve society well, either at home or abroad, must be equipped with tangible skills and talents. This would include the health sciences, education in all its parts, technology in its infinite array, and certainly the arts and skills of social work.

To deliver on promises of this magnitude -- and this has particular reference to guidance counselors -- our schools must weigh the impact of two challenging assignments. First, as teachers and counselors we will need to become job market analysts, with a touch of clairvoyance thrown in, for that is the counselor's art, apart from his science. To steer youngsters into fields that promise rewarding jobs when they enter the labor market three to five years hence, you will certainly need to know what opportunities there will likely be three to five years from now -- in your community, your State, and nationwide. And I might add that we in the Office of Education are working with the Department of Labor on this -- not through simple linear projections of the status quo, and certainly not through what the personnel Vice President thinks he needs

next year. Second, you will need to establish a placement service that will actually get young people into jobs. I would like to say a bit about these responsibilities later on; they are an important part of the minimum guarantee I feel the educational system owes our young people.

Last June I met with the Chief State School Officers to outline these minimum student guarantees I believe are essential. I talked about the continuing and largely successful efforts of the Office of Education to improve vocational education programs, to provide graduate fellowships for guidance counselors, to encourage young people to consider careers in technical fields requiring less than a four year college degree, and to provide a number of other career-related services. As you know, some of these programs go all the way back to the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917.

The chiefs, like those of us at the Federal level, are acutely aware of the piecemeal nature of these programs, just as State and local efforts have been piecemeal through the years. I asked them if they, on behalf of their States, could commit themselves to active, even aggressive engagement in the installation of an entirely new approach to career education, from kindergarten through graduate school, that would require new and demanding roles for teachers, curriculum specialists, conunselors, and nearly everyone else involved in the educational process.

Their response was a strong and encouraging affirmative. I told them about the four career education models being developed by

the research community with Office of Education initiative and which are now ready to be further validated in live situations.

I see the financial assistance, the technical assistance, and most of all the national leadership and support needed to get these models into operation as perhaps the greatest single contribution the Federal government can make to education in the coming decade. But the Federal role as implied earlier must be subordinated to the State and local initiative.

The first of these four career education designs -- and the one most pertinent to my discussions with the Chief State School Officers and this audience -- is the school-based model. This model calls for the restructuring of our elementary and secondary school curricula to begin to familiarize youngsters with basic information about occupations in the primary grades, to help them get exposure to real work situations in the middle years, and to prepare them in senior high school either to enter their chosen field with a marketable skill at graduation or sooner, or go on for techinal or professional training at the college level. This model eliminates the general high school curriculum altogether. Instead, it builds a career orientation into the basic academic subjects all along the line, and helps every youngster learn about the many career choices available in such fields as manufacturing, marketing, health sciences, communications, public service, the professions and the trades. It gives <u>every</u> young person the necessary preparation to earn a living in a field he selects well before he leaves the educational system.

It is not designed for the minority of students who go to college, or the minority who select traditional vocational programs. It is simply for everyone, in varying degrees, according to his maturity and interests -- but for everyone.

We in the Office of Education are implementing our faith in this career education concept with some concentrated work and funds; specifically we have launched six pilot projects in communities that represent a cross-section of socio-economic populations. School systems in these districts had already been moving toward career education on their own or with State help. They are located in Mesa, Arizona; Los Angeles; Atlanta; Jefferson County, Colorado; Pontiac, Michigan and Hackensack, New Jersey. And now I have asked each State to launch with Federal funds the planning of at least one model this year.

In addition to the school-based are the other three career education models. One is employer-based, providing a structure for industrial firms, businesses, and government agencies to operate work-training programs related to their own employment needs for students still in school as well as for dropouts. Clearly this is an alternate to conventional school. But clearly there must be counselors in the design -- perhaps even more necessary than in the school-based model.

Another, the home-based model, will use TV and correspondence courses among other devices to bring undereducated adults back into the mainstream of formal education or to help them get better jobs than they have. The last of the four we call the rural residential

model; its first site is a former Air Force base near Glasgow, Montana, where entire families will live and train together for new and upgraded employment. This site serves six largely rural states.

My meeting with the Chief State School Officers was a high point in my first year as Commissioner of Education. As I indicated to you a moment ago, they endorsed the career education concept to a man. To a man they were willing to pledge the resources of their offices and their personal powers of persuasion as we attempt to hammer out the evolving definition and design of this large idea. To a man they assured me that career education is not just another education fad; this is a concept, they held, that must be advanced, and that all schools and their communities must have a hand in the process.

By no means are all of the initiatives on behalf of career education coming out of Washington. In many instances the support of the Chief State School Officers for Federal initiatives is really an extension of convictions and actions already amply demonstrated at State and local levels and among professional associations such as yours. Clear prototypes of this concept were established in Pittsburgh, for example, at least seven years ago. Philadelphia and its Parkway School is a clear prototype of the employer-based option for eager learners.

The Arizona legislature last spring approved $2 million in State funding to launch career education in 15 school systems this year. Other States with outstanding examples of local efforts to install

career education programs include Delaware, Georgia, Mississippi, New Jersey, North Dakota, and Wyoming. Large-city systems turning to career education include those of Dallas and San Diego, as well as Pittsburgh and Philadelphia.

I understand that your association has launched some exciting initiatives of your own. Your surveys of local employment markets throughout Pennsylvania, your identification of available job opportunities and salary ranges, plus the 200 or so job descriptions you have put on the desks of every junior high school counselor in the State are the practical, down-to-earth kinds of commitments and initiatives we urgently need. I commend your efforts and hope that many other professional groups will follow with similar initiatives.

So I think it is fair to say that a heartening number of the professionals, be they educators or legislators, are committed to career education. Still open is the question of local citizen commitment.

Career education startup costs are expected to add considerably to the local burden for the first year or two, then taper off to a level somewhat above present expenditure levels for elementary and secondary education. Money will be needed to train school staff to integrate career education concepts into curriculum materials at every grade level, buy tools and more sophisticated equipment for hands-on high school programs, and to hire many more guidance counselors so that counseling or at least job awareness can be

brought all the way down to the early grades. Career entry placement, as I noted earlier, should be a new obligation of the schools, and I can think of no better national model for this role than that exemplary humane professional, Rose Lewis Smith of Pittsburgh! While Federal and State funds are sufficient to mount pilot projects, I think major support of school systems will remain primarily a local and State responsibility for the foreseeable future.

I am convinced, however, that once voters understand that their extra tax dollars are buying genuine motivation and career security for their own children, and for every other child in the community, they will support the necessary bond issues and tax increases. For this design moves us a long forward step toward public accountability cost effectiveness.

Those of you in personnel and guidance, in industry, in State and local govenment will in no small measure determine which way voters go on this proposal -- by your own enthusiasm for career education, by your willingness to plead the case in public forum and private conversation, by your ability to demonstrate its long-term cost-effectiveness and by your determination to prevent yet another generation of young people from floundering into the labor market unprepared. And most of all by <u>being</u> part of the planning and design process.

To close on an appropriate "Quo Vadis?" note, let me address several questions, really issues, to those of you working directly in personnel and guidance because you have the key responsibilities in making career education work.

Where do you stand on career education? Which way are you prepared to go? Are you willing to assume a far more demanding and complex role in relation to students, teachers, and the workaday world than you have ever known?

Are you ready to work hand-in-glove with teachers, curriculum developers, industry and labor, and other professional people to integrate the work concept with academic subjects, from kindergarten through grade 12?

Are you prepared to advise as wisely and well the students who are not going on to college as those who are? Are you willing to undertake for yourself the reorientation --- perhaps even retraining --- you will need to provide practical advice on up to 20,000 job categories? Because education is the only field most counselors know first-hand, would you accept experience, part-time during the school year or summers, in a drafting shop, factory, salesroom, or hospital? Are you willing to enhance your professionalism by gaining first-hand knowledge in a less than professional position to pass on to students?

Are your contacts in local industry, commerce, and government good enough for you to provide realistic job placement, and followup, for high school graduates and early spin-offs who have a wide variety of interests and abilities?

Are you forward looking enough to keep abreast of job market projections 5 or 10 years ahead?

In sum, are you sufficiently sold on the career education concept to become its advocate in the school system and community, to take on added responsibilities that will complicate your personal life but also, I am convinced, bring a new sense of personal satisfaction? I know of no greater reward for any of us than the knowledge that we have helped other human beings find fulfillment in their lives.

Helping children and young people find their way is the greatest satisfaction of all. As we install career education programs, we will in essence be putting students at the crossroads time and time again, asking them to make a decision, to choose a route. It should be satisfying to know that each time they reach a turning point, you will be there to show them the many options, to advise them on the probable outcomes, and to watch them grow into competent and confident adults.

Perhaps the single most important message of career education is the one best known to guidance counselors -- a young person will grow and learn and flourish increasingly as he becomes self-motivated through informed self-determination of his own destiny.

# # # #

OE-OC
VT

CAREER EDUCATION --- 300 DAYS LATER*

By S. P. Marland, Jr.
U.S. Commissioner of Education
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

First, a word of explanation about my brilliant attire: Two weeks ago, in a pleasant little ceremony in my office in Washington, I was formally inducted into honorary membership in the Vocational Industrial Clubs of America, with all rights and privileges pertaining thereto --- including that of wearing, upon appropriate occasions such as this, the official VICA red blazer.

(Let me insert parenthetically at this point that I enthusiastically support all vocational education youth groups, including the Future Farmers of America, the Future Business Leaders of America, the Office Education Association, the Distributive Education Clubs of America, and --- in no order of preference, I assure you,ladies --- the Future Homemakers of America. I really should be wearing six jackets! In any case I wanted to appear before you as well prepared sartorically as I hope I am intellectually to do justice to my subject which, you will not be surprised to learn, is career education.)

For as Commissioner I have not only taken on a jacket that is symbolic of the deep and necessary relationship between education and work, but I have also taken on as vigorously and intensively as I can the task of redefining and strengthening that relationship. For more than 300 days --- virtually my entire term of office to date --- I have been

*Before the Annual Convention of the American Vocational Association, Memorial Coliseum, Portland, Oregon, Monday, December 6, 1971, 8:00 p.m.

delivering myself of earnest statements on the career education theme. It was in Houston last January, before the National Association of Secondary School Principals, that I first advanced the concept --- and to my satisfaction the trial balloon launched that day has not been deflated since; in fact it seems to be gaining altitude as I have begun to hear those two words spoken with increasing frequency throughout the country --- not simply the echo of my voice, but from the lips of men and women like yourselves who recognize in that phrase a responsive and workable theme for the thoroughgoing reform of education in this country. Indeed, most of you were believers long before we started exploring this theme in the Office of Education.

The response that we are getting is one of almost universal affirmation: The people within education and, most important, the people outside the profession, want education in this country to produce in our children the sort of competence, of preparedness, that is implicit in career education. Career education is proving a sweepingly popular concept both from the viewpoint of the hard-nosed critic who hasn't found much to praise in a good number of years, and from that of the education professional, the teacher who has been searching for a system that will use his talents and satisfy his pride in his calling and his ambitions for himself and for his students. In the past few weeks we have received more than 4,000 letters that convey not just mild but enthusiastic applause. And I must say that this kind of demonstration confirms my visceral feelings and encourages me to press forward with all the resources and power of my office.

When I speak of the popularity of career education, and tell you that I believe that the idea has touched a very deep chord of response throughout this country, I don't think that in that moment I am being guilty of self-deception arising from misguided pride of authorship. Because I freely acknowledge that career education is not essentially a new idea and that it certainly did not spring full-blown from the brow of Marland that January day in Houston. The fact is that a remarkably broad range of individuals and organizations have called for just such a movement in recent years. President Nixon devoted a substantial portion of his 1970 Message on Higher Education to the need for expanded occupational training at the community college level. And as you undoubtedly recall, the AVA House of Delegates produced at your 1966 annual convention a resolution spelling out in some detail a program to expand vocational education into the universality of career education.

Many of you on a less formal basis have dreamed and talked of the day when your field would receive recognition as being of central importance to the education process, rather than a peripheral and faintly inelegant school specialty. Today I would say, through our combined efforts, that day has moved a good deal closer.

My part, then, is not to falsely claim the invention of career education. I am content to be its advocate and perhaps its embellisher. As such, my part is to press for the realization of career education as an idea whose time has most emphatically arrived, to speak for it to anyone who will sit still long enough to hear me out. I said in

Houston that career training at the secondary level must be accorded the same prestige, the same careful preparation, the same sober planning, the same recognition as the college preparatory curriculum. I still hold this to be an essential and an extremely important component of career education. But I do not speak of career education solely in the sense of job training, as important as it is.

I prefer instead to use career in a much broader connotation --- as a stream of continued growth and progress. Career in that sense strongly implies that education can be made to serve <u>all</u> the needs of an American --- teaching, to begin with, the skills and refinements of the workaday world, for if we cannot at the minimum prepare a man or woman to earn a living, our efforts are without worth. But career education must go beyond occupational needs to what we can think of as <u>survival skills</u> --- the interpersonal and organizational understanding without which one simply cannot exist in a modern nation-state, addressing effectively the matter of living itself, touching on all its pragmatic, theoretical, and moral aspects. That is what I mean in the broadest sense by career education --- and that is the way in which I envision the learning process being carried forward in the schools of this Nation, in its homes and businesses and government offices, and perhaps its streets since, for some, much of what is really educational occurs there.

This is what I have been saying in Houston before the high school principals, in Pittsburgh before old friends of my 20 years in that city, in Washington before the movers and shakers from the Congress and the Government agencies, even in Geneva, Switzerland, where I had

the opportunity in September to present the notion to a UNESCO-sponsored conference of educators from many countries.

But today we come straight to the kitchen table, with the family, where no rhetoric or pretense can get by. Today I bring the message to Portland and address the most knowledgeable and sophisticated audience of all --- the vocational educators of America. Today I speak as Commissioner for the first time to the men and women whose enthusiastic support --- or lack of it --- will mean success or failure for the somewhat matured but still very fluid career education reform movement. If the idea is to take off, then this is the time and the place to begin the ascent. Whatever the eventual accomplishments recorded in the name of career education, however successful we eventually are in correcting the present disparity between the technological society and a whole system of anachronistic public institutions, the plain fact is that the career education movement must start in the schools and it must be built upon your record of accomplishment in training high school graduates for the world of work. That success has been substantial as the facts of youth unemployment --- a dread specter shadowing and menacing our society --- illustrate.

The average unemployment rate of vocational education graduates between the ages of 18 and 24 --- the young men and women you have trained --- is only 5.2 percent, substantially less than the unemployment rate for the Nation as a whole. Contrasted with this excellent

showing is a jobless rate of at least 24 percent for those in the same age group who have not had the benefit of your instruction, those who have been exposed with few beneficial consequences to other kinds of high school curricula, most likely the so-called general courses. In some areas -- inner-city black ghettos, for example, or southwestern barrios --- the 24 percent figure is ludicrously unrepresentative; 75 percent in some instances would be closer to the mark for these communities where young people are trained ineffectively for useful work, but terribly effectively for unemployment, welfare, and revenge against the society that many of them feel has rejected them out of hand.

You are providing this capable, effective brand of education to nearly nine million persons enrolled in the Nation's vocational classes, including more than 3,500,000 in postsecondary and adult categories. You are giving special services to more than 800,000 disadvantaged in order that they may succeed in their training. Enrollment of the handicapped in vocational training now exceeds 100,000, and this figure, as indeed all figures relating to vocational training, is steadily expanding.

This broadscale vocational education program which you are operating with such conspicuous success must be viewed as the core of career education, the source of much of our hoped-for success on the broader career education canvas.

And so my principal concern this evening is not to persuade you that a comprehensive program of career education is needed in this country ---

who knows it better than you? --- but instead to outline for you the actions that we are taking in the Office of Education to support vocational education as the keystone of the career education arch. You are questioning some of our actions with regard to vocational education legislation and expressing concern as to the place and status accorded vocational education within the Office of Education hierarchy. Your interest in these matters is wholly logical and wholly proper and, I believe, warrants my careful explanation. For the facts are --- as I will detail them in a moment --- that vocational education has never enjoyed greater prestige within the Office of Education than it does at this moment under the capable leadership of Dr. Robert Worthington. Moreover, I believe, the legislative prospects for strengthening vocational education are brighter now than they have ever been, brighter than in the days of the Smith-Hughes Act, the Vocational Education Act of 1963, or even the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968. Let me address myself to the legislative situation first, specifically to our position on the Occupational Education Act of 1971 and the proposal to extend the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968.

While the concept embodied in the Occupational Education Act is entirely consistent with and supportive of our career education objective, we believe that as nearly as we can see now, given sufficient funds the present laws already provide authority for all the kinds of things we are talking about at the elementary and secondary levels. Moreover, one major part of the proposed bill --- the establishment of a deputy commissioner for vocational education and the extremely detailed proposed staffing pattern of his office --- would introduce administrative direction to an operating agency which I or any Commissioner of Education

would find undesirable as a matter of principle. Each of you, I feel, would find legislated structure of your offices an unlikely way to exercise your leadership. For declaring by law a new deputy for OE would not so much enhance the prospects and status of vocational education within the Office of Education as it would unbalance the present carefully designed and, I would say, largely successful organization that has been established during the past year. Since organization has not been a strong suit in OE in recent years, we are understandably reluctant to abandon a system that appears to be functioning well. In this structure Dr. Worthington serves as an associate commissioner under Dr. Duane Mattheis, Deputy for School Systems, but works closely with me on a day-to-day basis as indeed he has since his arrival. This arrangement, furthermore, enables us to integrate career education throughout the entire organization with the result that today it engages the attention of our people in elementary and secondary programs, in research, in handicapped, in higher education, in disadvantaged, in budget and planning --- indeed, in every major component of the Office of Education. No other program in OE has this kind of across-the-board involvement. Certainly changing the title to deputy would not increase this involvement. But it would, I believe, immediately suggest to other advocacy groups that we should promptly have a deputy, say for the disadvantaged, or the Right To Read, or for handicapped children, or educational technology --- all very important and high priority issues in my office. And, of course, the number of people reporting to me organizationally would multiply to the point of ineffectiveness.

Returning to the matter of principle, apart from the organizational issue, if I am to bring to the cause my experience, my belief, and my commitment as Commissioner --- and to be held accountable for the results of my stewardship --- then I must insist upon the necessary freedoms in administering programs, funds, and personnel entrusted to me by the Congress. Let me give you a practical example of the discretion of which I speak.

Part C of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 authorize $18 million for vocational education research for Fiscal Year 1972 --- half distributed directly to the States and half provided to the Commissioner to support activities in this area that he conceives of as worthwhile. It was my decision, as I advised the Chief State School Officers in September, to allocate my share of the purse --- $9 million --- to the States on a formula basis to begin their own model building in career education. I took this step because the Chiefs assured me that they and their staff were anxious to initiate career education at the State level. As Federal funds go, $9 million is not a world-shaking sum. But it's a start and we've taken it out of our hide in order to help States do their own creative work within the broad criteria we have laid down --- to develop, test, and demonstrate at least one career education project beginning in September 1972. We know there are risks inherent in this kind of move, but we are also well aware that career education will never amount to anything more than perhaps the title of a speech unless we are willing to take those risks, ready even to have some of the projects fall flat on their faces. In any

event, we need State models in operation immediately, rather than relying on the slow and uncertain and costly process of reinventing the same wheel in every town and community across America.

In our appearance before the House General Subcommittee on Education in September, we also requested that the Vocational Education Amendments not be extended through Fiscal Year 1975, not because we fail to recognize the merit in this legislation, but because we believe it would be an error to make a firm decision on extension without first giving careful consideration to the Administration's revenue-sharing proposal, and the impending impact of career education which may carry considerably beyond the scope and purpose of existing legislation.

The specifics of revenue sharing have been aired frequently enough during the past year that they need not detain us unduly at this time. Suffice it to say that vocational education is one of the five major areas of national priority into which education special revenue-sharing dollars would be divided according to priorities established in each State. We believe that enactment of the revenue-sharing concepts would result in more money going to vocational programs than under the present arrangement, but however that eventually works out, we are certain that the revenue-sharing system would greatly simplify administration of Federal funds both in Washington and in the States and communities. Wherever you stand in the many-sided argument about State versus Federal responsibilities in administering education support, there seems no question that simplification of the kind promised by the Administration's revenue-sharing design is critically

needed and would be welcomed by all. For those of us in Washington, revenue sharing would mean release from burdensome and unproductive administrative chores; for you in the States it would mean freedom to identify your own priorities and to develop plans to meet them; for the children and young adults, it would mean, we are persuaded, a far more relevant and far more effective educational experience, responding to the judgements of you and your State and local colleagues as distinct from the remote and necessarily constraining Federal Government.

But since revenue sharing rests in the lap of the gods, we intend to work within existing authorities, particularly those established under the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, in order to move as rapidly as we can toward realization of our career education objectives. We have submitted to the Office of Management and Budget a proposed Fiscal Year 1973 budget which would substantially increase funding for a number of career-education-related programs, including vocational work-study, cooperative education, grants to States for innovative programs, and a number of higher education efforts including Cooperative Education, Talent Search, Special Services in College, and Upward Bound.

We are also seeking a major increase in funding to support the four career education models under the Cooperative Research Act, our principal source of discretionary research money. Fifty or sixty percent of our resources in the development area will continue to go to career education because it is our intention to promote vigorously the exploration, development, and utilization of sound alternatives to the college entrance

folklore. Emphasis on R&D at the Federal level will insure that the States will have a number of validated models, both within the States and beyond, ready for installation when they are given major responsibility for Federal education funds under revenue sharing.

The career-education models which are being developed under the leadership of Dr. Worthington and Dr. Rue Harris of the National Center for Educational Research and Development are, as you probably know, school-based, employer-based, home-based, and residential-based. Some beginning progress is being realized with all of them, though the furthest advanced is the school-based effort. This model is undergoing systematic testing in the field in six local school districts --- Mesa, Arizona; Los Angeles, California; Jefferson County, Colorado; Atlanta, Georgia; Pontiac, Michigan; and Hackensack, New Jersey. The six systems are working with the Ohio State University Center for Vocational and Technical Development to complete development of their models with the objective of giving students informed guidance, counseling, and instruction throughout their school years, K-12, to make career development in essence what it should be --- part of the curriculum from childhood through adulthood.

But we in OE recognize that career education cannot come about solely as a result of the Federal funds we administer. And so we are determined to serve as the catalyst in the reaction --- to disseminate our research findings throughout the Nation, to encourage development and installation of career education projects, to attract to the movement the interest and support of everyone from the Chief State School Officers to the students themselves.

And so at the initiation of Dr. Worthington there will be held beginning in March and extending through May a series of 17 regional assemblies, designed in cooperation with State leaders to carry the word to school administrators, to businessmen, to labor leaders, to boards of education, to teachers, to guidance counselors, and to laymen. These sessions will last a week or more. They will call together not only the decision-makers but also the practitioners who must ultimately carry out the career education philosophy.

There will be no real change as a result of any speechmaking I may undertake if the people at the local level --- the faculty and the superintendents and board of education members --- do not feel themselves deeply engaged in the process. Schools throughout the country are not wholly objects of trust and affection, as we recognize. The way that seems most feasible to us to correct this is to take the affirmative and dramatic measures in this reform effort that will bring more reality to teaching and learning and that will give young people a far more convincing and realistic reason than they presently have for being in school. This cannot happen without the genuine engagement of people at the local level, professional and nonprofessional. They must believe deeply in career education. The series of 17 regional meetings is a start toward letting people decide for themselves whether they think this is going to make sense, and indeed to sharpen and illuminate the evolving definition of what career education is, and what it may become.

What I have tried to indicate to you this evening is that career education is not a major OE priority in name only, a paper goal; career education is <u>the</u> major objective of the Office of Education at this moment in time and will remain so for the foreseeable future. I cannot pretend that all the pieces are in place. We can't know at this early stage what all the pieces of this puzzle are, let alone where they fit into the overall design. But it is important to remember that we are making an honest and, I believe time will demonstrate, an effective effort to get this movement underway. In addition to the steps I have already alluded to, I want to mention that I am assembling an ad hoc panel of the finest academicians I can persuade to join in this task. They will scrutinize career education thoroughly from the vantage point of other disciplines and contribute to it the scholarship needed to give it authentic substance as well as literary articulation. We want career education examined from the historian's viewpoint, and from that of the curriculum authority, the vocational education authority, psychologist, sociologist, businessman, attorney, labor expert, philosopher, economist, local and State official, teacher, college official, and of course, the students themselves. We want all of these types to take a long and critical look at career education, to tell us what they believe this reform should compass, to help guide our first infant steps. For we are truly talking about something considerably more than a curriculum. We are talking about a substantive social process in its early and faltering stages.

I have received assurances from your earlier resolutions and public statements that you in vocational education, you who have borne the heat of the day in the vineyards which the rest of us are approaching for virtually the first time, are ready to lend your experience and your strength and your enthusiasm to the drive to design and effect career education. I respect this and am grateful for your confidence.

Let me close by quoting Lowell Burkett's column in the October 1971 issue of the American Vocational Journal:

> Vocational educators should assume a leadership role in every aspect of this movement. All vocational educators should be involved, helping wherever and whenever they can to bring the concept of career education to fruition. For if this concept evolves without input from vocational educators, it could lose those elements of vocational education that have proved their value, and like so many hopeful movements before it, it could go down the drain. Indeed, the task of establishing this concept in the nation's schools will require the commitment of all educators, vocational or otherwise.
>
> It is a momentous cause calling for educational statesmanship of the highest order, and it is my hope that vocational educators will emerge as the real statesmen.

Lowell has been a strong right arm to the Office in this total enterprise. I value at the highest level his wisdom and comradeship

and his ready and constructive criticisms. Let me say again his final sentence: "and it is my hope that vocational educators will emerge as the real statesmen."

I think that about sums it up.

# # #